



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/733,340	12/12/2003	James L. McElhannon	116522	7470
<div>25944      7590      10/31/2007</div> <div>OLIFF &amp; BERRIDGE, PLC</div> <div>P.O. BOX 320850</div> <div>ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850</div>				
			<div>EXAMINER</div> <div>JEAN, FRANTZ B</div>	
			<div>ART UNIT</div> <div>2154</div>	<div>PAPER NUMBER</div>
			<div>MAIL DATE</div> <div>10/31/2007</div>	<div>DELIVERY MODE</div> <div>PAPER</div>

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/733,340

Applicant(s)

MCELHANNON, JAMES L.

Examiner

Frantz B. Jean

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 August 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 and 15-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13, 15-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

This office action is in response to applicant's arguments filed on 08/08/07. Claims 1-13 and 15-24 are still pending in this application. Claim 14 has been canceled.

#### ***Claim Objections***

The objection to claim 18 has been withdrawn in view of applicant's arguments.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-2, 5, 10-13, and 15-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rozmanith et al. hereinafter Rozmanith, US patent number 5,185,857.

As per claim 1, Rozmanith teaches a method for translating data in a host response into a format for use by a client (col. 8 lines 59-68), comprising: defining at least one pattern expected to occur in the host response (col. 14 lines 16-31); detecting a match between the at least one expected pattern and the host response (col. 9 lines 50-55; col. 10 lines 59-61); and outputting data of the host response in a format based on the matched pattern to the client (col. 8 lines 59-68).

As per claim 2, Rozmanith teaches a method of claim 1, wherein defining at least one

Art Unit: 2154

pattern comprises defining patterns by using a plurality of regular expressions to represent the data of the host response (col. 14 lines 23-31).

As per claim 5, Rozmanith teaches a method of determining an identity of a host response (col. 10 lines 51-52), comprising: selecting a file containing at least one pattern expected to occur in the host response (col. 14 lines 16-31); detecting a match between the at least one expected pattern and the host response (col. 9 lines 50-55); and determining the identity of the host response based on the selected file (col. 10 lines 48-55).

As per claim 10, Rozmanith teaches a host/client interface system, comprising: at least one host computer (fig 1, element 14); at least one client computer (12); a host/client interface computer (see fig 1; col. 6 lines 46-68) which operates to receive input commands from the client computer, transmit the commands to the at least one host computer, and receive host responses to the command; comprises a host response parser (col. 10 lines 41-47), which retrieves the data from the host responses by comparing the host response with an expected data pattern, and when the host response matches the data pattern, retrieves the data from the host response and formats the data according to the matched pattern (col. 10 lines 48-61; col. 14 lines 16-31).

As per claim 11, Rozmanith teaches a host/client interface system of claim 10, wherein

the host/client interface computer further operates to translate the input commands into a format usable by the host computer (see col. 10 lines 41-47).

As per claim 12, Rozmanith teaches host/client interface system of claim 10, wherein the host/client interface computer further operates to retrieve data from the host responses (col. 10 lines 48-55).

As per claim 13, Rozmanith teaches host/client interface system of claim 10, wherein the host/client interface computer further operates to format the retrieved data into a form usable by the client computer (col. 8 lines 58-68).

As per claim 16, Rozmanith discusses mainframe (col. 1 line 44) and computer operated by a commercial service provider (commercial airliner col. 5 lines 49-50).

As per claim 17, Rozmanith teaches host/client interface system of claim 16, wherein the commercial service provider is at least one of an airline (col. 5 lines 49-50), a car rental agency, a hotel, and a bank.

As per claim 18, Rozmanith teaches host/client interface system of claim 10, wherein the at least one client computer comprises at least one of a self-service kiosk, a terminal emulator (element 12; col. 6 lines 3-10; col. 12 lines 47-50), or a common language facility client computer.

Art Unit: 2154

As per claim 19, Rozmanith's workstation (12) can be considered to be a self-service kiosk that is operated by customers when needed.

As per claim 20, Rozmanith's terminal emulator can be operated by passengers booking agents and other users for a commercial service provider (element 12; col. 6 lines 3-10; col. 12 lines 47-50).

As per claim 21, Rozmanith teaches host/client interface system of claim 20, wherein the commercial service provider is at least one of an airline (col. 5 lines 49-50), a car rental agency, a hotel, and a bank.

As per claim 22, Rozmanith teaches host/client interface system of claim 10, wherein the host/client interface computer further includes a client manager layer portion, which accepts input from the at least one client computer (col. 13 line 64; col. 8 lines 46-68).

As per claim 23, Rozmanith teaches host/client interface system of claim 10, wherein the host/client interface computer further includes a host communications layer portion, which translates client commands into commands understood by the host computer (col. 8 lines 58-68; col. 6 lines 46-68).

As per claim 24, Rozmanith teaches host/client interface system of claim 10, wherein

the host/client interface computer further comprises a memory, which stores the data patterns expected in the host responses (col. 5 lines 51-64; col. 6 lines 46-68).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 3-4, 6-9, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rozmanith in view of Lektion et al. hereinafter ("Lektion") US patent Number 6,446,110.

As per claim 3, Rozmanith does not teach using an extensible markup language. This feature is well known and expected in the art as evidenced by Lektion (see fig 4-9). It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Lektion XML's feature to Rozmanith because the use of XML to represent host screen image and defining pattern would make host image screen and the pattern information interchangeable and easy to share (Lektion col. 11 lines 5-16). One skill artisan at the time of the invention would be motivated to use XML to define pattern because of its flexibility in displaying image (see Lektion col. 11 line 10).

As per claim 4, the combination Rozmanith-Lection teaches defining patterns by using a plurality of regular expressions to represent the data of the host response (see Lection col. 14 lines 23-31).

As per claim 6, Rozmanith teaches a computer-readable storage medium storing a data file comprising: at least one data pattern is expressed using a plurality of regular expressions (col. 14 lines 23-31), and wherein the at least one data pattern defines a pattern expected to occur in a host response to a client (col. 14 lines 16-23). However, Rozmanith does not teach using an extensible markup language. This feature is well known and expected in the art as evidenced by Lection (see fig 4-9). It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Lection XML's feature to Rozmanith because the use of XML to represent host screen image and defining pattern would make host image screen and the pattern information interchangeable and easy to share (Lection col. 11 lines 5-16). One skill artisan at the time of the invention would be motivated to use XML to define pattern because of its flexibility in displaying image (see Lection col. 11 line 10).

As per claim 7, the combination Rozmanith-Lection teaches a computer executing a host response parser application (col. 10 lines 41-47) using the computer-readable stage medium of claim 6, wherein the host response parser application selects the at least one data pattern of the data file, compares the selected data pattern with the data of a host response, and when the comparison yields a match, retrieves the matched data from the host response (see Rozmanith col. 10 lines 48-61).



As per claim 8, Rozmanith-Lection teaches a computer according to claim 7, wherein the computer further formats the matched data of the host response in accordance with the at least one data pattern (Rozmanith col. 10 lines 41-47).

As per claim 9, the combination Rozmanith-Lection teaches computer according to claim 7, wherein the computer further returns the matched data to a client unit for display (col. 10 lines 56—61).

As per claim 15, Rozmanith teaches host/client interface system of claim 14, wherein elements of the data pattern are expressed using regular expressions (col. 14 lines 23-31). However, Rozmanith does not teach using an extensible markup language. This feature is well known and expected in the art as evidenced by Lection (see fig 4-9). It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Lection XML's feature to Rozmanith because the use of XML to represent host screen image and defining pattern would make host image screen and the pattern information interchangeable and easy to share (Lection col. 11 lines 5-16). One skill artisan at the time of the invention would be motivated to use XML to define pattern because of its flexibility in displaying image (see Lection col. 11 line 10).

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed on 08/08/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argued that Rozmanith does not teach: 1) defining a pattern expected to occur in host response; detecting a match and outputting data of the host response in a format based on the matched pattern to the client; 2) a host response parser.

In response examiner submits that applicants have misinterpreted the prior art of record.

Rozmanith teaches defining at least one pattern expected to occur in the host response (see abstract and col. 14 lines 16-31; the abstract discloses select and displays related graphical and text information based on analysis by the system as to what graphics elements or images satisfied the operator query; in other words, a search for a pattern is part of the query); detecting a match between the at least one expected pattern and the host response (col. 9 lines 50-55, number of record matching query; col. 10 lines 59-61); and outputting data of the host response in a format based on the matched pattern to the client (col. 8 lines 59-68; col. 9 lines 5-35).

Regarding item 2), Rozmanith teaches a host parser (see Rozmanith col. 10 lines 41-47).

The examiner believes that the claims as written are not defined over the prior art of record to Rozmanith and Lektion. Therefore, the rejection has been maintained.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not


Art Unit: 2154

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Frantz B. Jean whose telephone number is 571-272-3937. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-6:00 M-f.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan J. Flynn can be reached on 571-272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

  
**FRANTZ B. JEAN**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**